REMARKS

This Resubmission of Supplemental Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 is filed in response to the Office Action dated January 16, 2004, in which the Examiner alleged that the Supplemental Amendment filed herein on October 15, 2003 was not fully responsive to the prior Office Action.

Claims 1-73 are all the claims presently pending in the application. Claims 1, 20, 39, 58, 59 and 60-67 have been amended to more particularly define the invention. Claims 71-73 have been added, and correspond to independent claims 1, 20 and 39 of the originally issued patent (U. S. Pat. No. 6,112,202).

Applicant notes and greatly appreciates that a personal interview was conducted in this case on July 29, 2003. Applicant is grateful for the opportunity to discuss this case with the Examiner, and appreciates the Examiner's helpful comments made during the personal interview.

Further, Applicant notes that at the interview, the Examiner agreed with Applicant's representative that amending claims 1, 20 and 39 to incorporate a feature from claim 67 would overcome the cited references in this case. Applicant notes that this Supplemental Amendment amends claims 1, 20 and 39 in accordance with the Examiner's helpful suggestion. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that this case is in condition for immediate allowance.

It is noted that the claim amendments are made only for more particularly pointing out the invention, and not for distinguishing the invention over the prior art, narrowing the claims or for any statutory requirements of patentability. Further, Applicant specifically states that no amendment to any claim herein should be construed as a disclaimer of any interest in or right to an equivalent of any element or feature of the amended claim.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges that claims 14, 33 and 51 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. However, as noted above, claims 1, 20 and 39, from which these claims depend, respectively, have been amended and are in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant respectively submits that all of the claims are allowable.

I. FORMAT OF AMENDMENT

The Examiner alleges that the Supplemental Amendment filed herein on October 15, 2003 is not in proper format and applicant does not properly argue that new claims 71-73 have the same limitations as claims 1, 20 and 39. Applicant submits, however, that the Amendment is in the proper format.

Specifically, as noted above, newly added claims 71-73 correspond to independent claims 1, 20 and 39 of the originally issued patent (U. S. Pat. No. 6,112,202). Applicant notes that one of the errors sought to be corrected by this Reissue Application is the fact that Applicant in originally issued patent (U. S. Pat. No. 6,112,202) claimed less than he was entitled to claim. In this Reissue Application, Applicant has amended the originally issued claims to correct this error.

Further, the Examiner alleges that "[w]hile the "to..." limitation is there from the amended claims 1, 10, and 39, the "from ..." limitation is not present, therefore, the argument is non-responsive". However, newly added claims 71-73 are substantially identical to the originally issued claims 1, 20 and 39. Applicant notes that these claims were originally issued and clearly distinguish over the prior art of record and should certainly be patentable in this Reissue Application. Indeed, the limitations of "*means, provided on the recording medium, for directing the computer system to use the initial authoritativeness information as input authoritativeness information, to produce first authoritativeness information about a set of information resources pointed to by links in resources of the input set, and produce second authoritativeness information about a set of information resources having links that point to resources of the input set*", as recited in claim 71, "*using the initial authoritativeness information as input authoritativeness information, to produce first authoritativeness information about a set of information resources pointed to by links in resources of the input set, and produce second authoritativeness information about a set of information resources having links that point to resources of the input set*", as recited in claim 72, and "*means for using the initial authoritativeness information as input authoritativeness information, to produce first authoritativeness information about a set of information resources pointed to by links in resources of the input set, and produce second authoritativeness information about a set of*

information resources having links that point to resources of the input set", as recited in claim 73, are clearly not taught or suggested by Page et al. nor, for that matter any of the prior art of record.

Moreover, Applicant respectfully points out that these claims may not include the "from ... limitation" as referred to by the Examiner. However, this limitation was not included in the originally issued claims 1, 20 and 39 and, therefore, is not needed for patentability.

Further, the Examiner has failed to identify the "format" to which the Examiner alleges the Amendment does not comply. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims of the present Application fully comply with the MPEP including MPEP §1412.01 which requires that the reissue claims "be for the same invention as that disclosed as being the invention in the original patent". Thus, if the Examiner maintains this objection, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner specifically identify the "format" to which he is referring.

Therefore, contrary to the Examiner's allegations, this Amendment is in the proper format.

II. THE REISSUE DECLARATION

The Examiner alleges that "the correction to the assent in the oath is still not perfected and therefore is still defective". In the Office Action dated March 20, 2003, the Examiner indicated that the Reissue Declaration was defective because there was no offer to surrender the patent, and there was no 3.73(b) statement showing that IBM is the assignee of the entire interest.

Submitted herewith is an Offer to Surrender Patent which addresses the concerns of the Examiner. Further, submitted herewith is a Submission of Statement Under 37 C. F. R. 3.73(b) which addresses the concerns of the Examiner.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that contrary to the Examiner's allegations, the Reissue Declaration is not defective.

III. FORMAL MATTERS AND CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1-73, all the claims presently

pending in the application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Assignee's Deposit Account No. 50-0510.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 2/17/04

Phillip E. Miller
Registration No. 46,060

McGinn & Gibb, PLLC
8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200
Vienna, VA 22182-3817
(703) 761-4100
Customer No. 21254

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that the foregoing Amendment was filed by facsimile with the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Examiner Charles Rones, Group Art Unit #2175 at fax number (703) 872-9306 this 17th day of February, 2004.

Phillip E. Miller, Esq.
Registration No. 46,060